

REMARKS

I. Status of Claims

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. No claims have been amended.

II. Objection to the Specification

The disclosure is objected to because the specification recites "Potato HS" at p. 17, line 3, without setting forth the meaning of "HS." *Office Action* at p. 2.

"Potato HS" is a trade name for a commercially available potato extract, as indicated by the enclosed page of the International Cosmetic Ingredient Dictionary and Handbook ("CTFA").¹ Accordingly, the Applicants have amended the specification at pp. 17-19 to replace "Potato HS" with "Potato HS®." By this amendment, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for lack of written description. *Office Action* at pp. 2-4. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

First, Applicants respectfully request clarification on the rejection. According to the *Office Action* at p. 2, claims 1-13 are rejected "as failing to comply with the enablement requirement." In the next paragraph at p. 3, however, the standards for written description are recited. There is no further comment in the *Office Action* on any lack of enablement rejection. Accordingly, Applicants will respond to this section under the assumption that claims 1-13 are rejected for lack of written description, and not enablement.

¹ Printout from CD-ROM of the International Cosmetic Ingredient Dictionary and Handbook, 8th ed., CTFA Scientific/Regulatory 2000.

The standard for written description under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is whether the specification conveys “with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, applicant was in possession of the invention.” M.P.E.P. § 2163.02; see, e.g., *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64 (Fed. Cir. 1991). It is not necessary that the claimed subject matter be described literally. M.P.E.P. § 2163.02.

The M.P.E.P. outlines the burden on the Examiner with regard to the written description requirement.

A description as filed is **presumed to be adequate**, unless or until **sufficient** evidence or reasoning to the contrary has been presented by the examiner to rebut the presumption.

M.P.E.P. § 2163.04 (added emphasis). Moreover, the M.P.E.P. explicitly states:

In rejecting a claim, the examiner must set forth **express findings of fact** which support the lack of written description conclusion.

M.P.E.P. § 2163.04.I (added emphasis). Applicants respectfully submit that such findings of fact have not been submitted here.

The Examiner’s rejection is two-fold. First, the Examiner alleges that it is “unclear from the specification the ingredients and the percentage of the ingredients comprising the plant extracts used in the making of the demonstrated combination of plant extract and sugar having the claimed therapeutic effect.” *Id.* at p. 4. Second, the Examiner alleges that the “specification lacks a sufficient number of species which have been described by complete structure or identifying characteristics,” and cites *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1997), to support the rejection. *Id.*

In the first part of the rejection, it appears that the Examiner is requiring extra limitations to satisfy the written description requirement, *i.e.*, that the specification must describe “ingredients and the percentage of the ingredients” of the extracts. Applicants respectfully disagree that the specification must set forth the precise components of the extract because the precise components are not an essential aspect for the claimed invention; rather it is the extract itself as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s requirement is excessive and improper because a written description only needs to be satisfied for the claimed invention. See *Amgen, Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.*, 314 F.3d 1313, 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (“[T]he patentee need only describe the invention as claimed.”). Thus, Applicants do not need to describe “ingredients and the percentage of the ingredients” of the extracts, as these aspects do not constitute the claimed invention. The claimed invention relates, in part, to at least one plant extract and not to these extra aspects.

Moreover, a “patent specification is directed to one of ordinary skill in the art.” *Wang Laboratories, Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.*, 993 F.2d 858, 866 (Fed. Cir. 1993). For example, the Federal Circuit has held that “protein content of at least about that of solvent extracted soybean meal” was sufficiently disclosed where the specification only disclosed a preferred protein content of 50%.” *Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar-Co, Inc.*, 772 F.2d 1570, 1575-1576 (Fed. Cir. 1985). In arriving at their conclusion, the Federal Circuit acknowledged the fact that soybean meal having protein at various concentrations were commercially available at the time of filing. *Id.* at 1576. Based on the knowledge available to one of ordinary skill in the art, the Federal Circuit held that the disclosure adequately supported the claimed protein content. *Id.*

Similarly, to demonstrate the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art on extracts, Applicants submit definitions from the CTFA¹ for exemplary extracts: potato extract, mistletoe extract, avocado extract, wheat germ extract, willowherb extract, and kidney bean extract. The CTFA is a well-recognized source for one of ordinary skill in the art, as it indicates its goal as a “single worldwide reference ... that will allow the identification of the composition of personal care products.” See Foreward at page v (emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the CTFA is a source that indicates the knowledge available to one of ordinary skill in the art in the identification of the composition of the extracts.

According to the CTFA, not one of the “extract” definitions require identification of “ingredients and the percentage of the ingredients.” Applicants respectfully submit that the absence of such details in the submitted definitions are evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art does not require such information, as alleged by the Examiner, to appreciate that Applicants have possession of the claimed invention.

In the second part of the rejection, the Examiner cites *Eli Lilly* to support the proposition that the written description requirement is not satisfied for failure to disclose “a sufficient number of species,” *i.e.*, ingredients and the percentage of the ingredients comprising the plant extracts. *Office Action* at p. 4. Applicants respectfully submit that *Eli Lilly* is inapplicable to the facts of this case for the same reasons articulated by the Federal Circuit in *Amgen*. There, the defendant alleged that the patentees failed to describe “all vertebrate and mammalian cells as engineered,” citing *Eli Lilly*. The Federal Circuit disagreed, explaining:

Both *Eli Lilly* and *Enzo Biochem* are inapposite to this case because the claim terms at issue here are not new or

unknown biological materials that ordinarily skilled artisans would easily miscomprehend.

Amgen, 314 F.3d at 1332. A similar rationale applies here. Applicants are not claiming an extract that one of ordinary skill would miscomprehend. Because the ingredients are immediately understood by one skilled in the art of personal care products, a listing of species is not necessary. Thus, the specification need not describe more.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that the specific "ingredients and the percentage of the ingredients" within each extract are not claimed. Thus, the specification only has to provide written description for at least one plant extract in accordance with Federal Circuit precedent:

If a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the inventor to have been in possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing, even if every nuance of the claims is not explicitly described in the specification, then the adequate written description requirement is met.

In re Alton, 76 F.2d 1168, 1175 (Fed. Cir. 1996). Here, Applicants have submitted evidence of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art that the application sufficiently discloses the extracts. See *e.g. specification* at pp. 9-12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is in error and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-13 are rejected as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. *Office Action* at pp. 5-6. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the claims must set forth the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention, and

the claims must particularly point out and distinctly define the metes and bounds of the subject matter that will be protected by the patent grant. See M.P.E.P. § 2171.

The Examiner continues to reject claims 1 and 37, alleging that “extract” is indefinite. Office Action at pp. 5-6. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants respectfully submit that the record contains sufficient evidence to show that “extract” has a well known meaning in the art, as demonstrated by the documents previously submitted by the Applicants defining “extract.” Moreover, as discussed above, the CTFA pages submitted herewith defining specific extracts do not define “extract” by describing the “temperature ... the extraction is performed,” the particular solvent, or “the step(s) by which the claimed ‘extract’ is/are obtained.” As articulated by the Federal Circuit, “it is not necessary that a claim recite each and every element needed for the practical utilization of the claimed subject matter.” *Stiftung v. Renishaw PLC*, 945 F.2d 1173, 1181 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is in error and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

V. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 7, and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by DE 198 10 120 C1 (“Fath et al.”). Office Action at pp. 6-8. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner cites Fath for disclosing a hair treatment composition containing 1.31% green tea extract, 0.5% wheat germ oil, and 1.131% sucrose. *Id.* at p. 7. According to the Examiner, although “Fath does not expressly teach that the composition can be used in the manner instantly claimed ... the intended use of the

claimed composition does not patentably distinguish the composition” because the use is allegedly “inherent.” *Id.*

A rejection under § 102 is only proper when the claimed subject matter, in this case a method of protecting keratinous fiber from extrinsic damage, is identically described or disclosed in the prior art. *In re Arkley*, 455 F.2d 586, 587 (CCPA 1972); see also M.P.E.P. § 706.02(a) (“For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly.”). Importantly, each and every element of a claim must be set forth in the prior art reference for there to be anticipation. See M.P.E.P. § 2131.

First, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under § 102(b) is in error. Fath published on May 27, 1999, which is less than one year before the filing date of the present application of March 17, 2000. Thus, the claims should stand rejected under § 102(a).

Applicants respectfully disagree that Fath anticipates the present claims. The basis for Examiner’s rejection is that the wheat germ oil disclosed by Fath is a plant extract. Applicants respectfully submit that an oil is not necessarily an extract, as an oil can be obtained as the result of a non-extraction process, such as cold pressing. Applicants do not observe any teaching in Fath that would indicate that the wheat germ oil is necessarily an extract. One of ordinary skill in the art reading Fath would not be able to determine that Fath describes a wheat germ extract as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Fath insufficiently describes the claimed invention. “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989); see also

M.P.E.P. § 2131. This has not been shown in Fath.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

VI. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 and 10-13 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fath et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,296,856 ("Pineau et al."). *Office Action* at pp. 8-11. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner asserts that "Fath teaches the claimed invention except for the claimed monosaccharides" and relies on Pineau for teaching a composition comprising heterogeneous polyholosides comprising 2 to 10 oses or monosaccharides." *Id.* at p. 9. The Examiner further states that "it would have been obvious ... to combine the instant ingredients for their known benefit since each is well known in the art for their claimed purpose." *Id.* at pp. 9-10.

Applicants respectfully disagree. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must demonstrate that there is some suggestion or motivation, either in the cited references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or combine reference teachings. See M.P.E.P. § 2143. Evidence of a suggestion or motivation to modify or combine references teachings must be "clear and particular." *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

As discussed above, Fath does not describe the claimed invention. Pineau does not remedy this deficiency. Pineau describes the use of polyholoside compositions beneficial for the skin. See *Abstract*. Pineau does not describe the usefulness of

polyholosides in connection with plant extracts. Thus, the combination of Fath and Pineau does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Applicants note the Examiner continues to rely on *In re Sussman*. In the previous Reply, Applicants had argued that the facts of *Sussman* are inapplicable to those of the present case and continue to maintain these arguments.

In re Geiger presents a more relevant case based on the specific facts. *In re Geiger*, 815 F.2d 686 (Fed. Cir. 1987). There, the appealed claims were directed to a combination of three ingredients for inhibiting scale formation in cooling water systems. *Id.* at 687. Each of these ingredients was separately taught by the references to prevent scale formation. *Id.* Because none of the references provided a suggestion or motivation to combine all three ingredients, the Federal Circuit found the claims patentable. *Id.* at 688. ("Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination."). Thus, it is not sufficient to combine individual components disclosed in separate references without a suggestion to do so.

The same situation is present here. There is no motivation in either reference to add the sugars taught by Pineau to the compositions of Fath. Pineau does not even contemplate the use of plant extracts. Each reference was merely cited for reciting the individual ingredients absent a suggestion or motivation for combining reference teachings, which is against Federal Circuit precedent, such as *Geiger*.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P

By: Maria T. Bautista
Maria T. Bautista
Reg. No. 52,516

DATE: March 19, 2004

SOLANUM TUBEROSUM (POTATO) EXTRACT

CAS No.
90083-08-2

EINECS No.
290-202-7

Definition: Solanum Tuberosum (Potato) Extract is an extract of the pulp of the potato, *Solanum tuberosum*.

Regulatory and Ingredient Use Information for Botanicals(1)

Chemical Class(es): Biological Products

Function(s): Skin-Conditioning Agent - Miscellaneous

Technical/Other Name(s):

Extract of Potato
Extract of Solanum Tuberosum Pulp
Potato Extract
Potato Pulp Extract
Solanum Tuberosum (EU)
Solanum Tuberosum Extract

Trade Name Mixture(s):

Potato HS(2) (Alban Muller)
VT-292 Extract of Potato(3) (Vege-Tech)

International Cosmetic Ingredient Dictionary and Handbook, 8th Edition, Printed Edition Page Number: 1405

Cross References: [International Buyers' Guide] (4) These hypertext links will activate when associated electronic books are purchased.

SOLANUM TUBEROSUM (POTATO) PEEL EXTRACT

Definition: Solanum Tuberosum (Potato) Peel Extract is an extract of the peel of the potato, *Solanum tuberosum*.

Regulatory and Ingredient Use Information for Botanicals(5)

Chemical Class(es): Biological Products

Function(s): Not Reported

Technical/Other Name(s):

Extract of Potato Peel
Extract of Solanum Tuberosum Peel
Potato Peel Extract
Solanum Tuberosum (EU)
Solanum Tuberosum Peel Extract

Trade Name Mixture(s):

VT-291 Extract of Potato Peel(6) (Vege-Tech)
VT-292 Extract of Potato Peel(7) (Vege-Tech)

International Cosmetic Ingredient Dictionary and Handbook, 8th Edition, Printed Edition Page Number: 1405

Cross References: [International Buyers' Guide] (8) These hypertext links will activate when associated electronic books are purchased.

VISCUM ALBUM (MISTLETOE) FRUIT EXTRACT

CAS No.

8031-76-3

84929-55-5

EINECS No.

284-538-3

Definition: Viscum Album (Mistletoe) Fruit Extract is an extract of the berries of the mistletoe, *Viscum album*.

Regulatory and Ingredient Use Information for Botanicals(1)

Information Source(s): HP, NED

Chemical Class(es): Biological Products

Function(s): Not Reported

Reported Product Categories: Body and Hand Preparations (Excluding Shaving Preparations)

Technical/Other Name(s):

Extract of Mistletoe

Extract of Viscum Album Berries

Mistletoe Berry Extract

Mistletoe Extract

Mistletoe Fruit Extract

Viscum Alba Extract

Viscum Album (EU)

Viscum Album Berry Extract

Trade Name Mixture(s):

Actiphyte of Mistletoe BG50(2) (Active Organics)

Actiphyte of Mistletoe GL50(3) (Active Organics)

Actiphyte of Mistletoe Lipo S(4) (Active Organics)

Actiphyte of Mistletoe PG50(5) (Active Organics)

Herbasol-Extract Mistletoe(6) (Cosmetochem)

Hexaplant Richter(7) (Chemisches Laboratorium)

Mistletoe Extract HS 2399 G(8) (Grau)

Mistletoe Extract, Water Soluble(9) (Croda GmbH)

Polyplant Base(10) (Provital/Centerchem)

Polyplant Base S.E.(11) (Provital/Centerchem)

Prodhy Extract Gui(12) (Prod'Hyg)

Sedaplant Richter(13) (Chemisches Laboratorium)

International Cosmetic Ingredient Dictionary and Handbook, 8th Edition, Printed Edition Page

Number: 1560

Cross References: [International Buyers' Guide] (14) These hypertext links will activate when associated electronic books are purchased.

VISCUM ALBUM (MISTLETOE) LEAF EXTRACT

Definition: Viscum Album (Mistletoe) Leaf Extract is an extract of the leaves of the mistletoe, *Viscum album*.

Regulatory and Ingredient Use Information for Botanicals(15)

Chemical Class(es): Biological Products

Function(s): Not Reported

Technical/Other Name(s):

Extract of Mistletoe Leaves
Extract of Viscum Album Leaves
Mistletoe Leaf Extract
Viscum Album (EU)
Viscum Album Leaf Extract

Trade Name Mixture(s):

VT-222 Extract of Mistletoe(16) (Vege-Tech)

International Cosmetic Ingredient Dictionary and Handbook, 8th Edition, Printed Edition Page Number: 1560

Cross References: [International Buyers' Guide] (17) These hypertext links will activate when associated electronic books are purchased.

PERSEA GRATISSIMA (AVOCADO) FRUIT EXTRACT

Definition: Persea Gratissima (Avocado) Fruit Extract is an extract of the fruit of the avocado, *Persea gratissima*.

Regulatory and Ingredient Use Information for Botanicals(1)

Information Source(s): See note below regarding entries, and links.JCIC, JCLS, JSQI

Chemical Class(es): Biological Products

Function(s): Not Reported

Technical/Other Name(s):

Avocado Extract

Avocado Fruit Extract

Extract of Avocado

Persea Americana Extract

Persea Gratissima (EU)

Tolune-2,4-Diamine,5,5'-((4-Methyl-m-Phenylene)Bis(Azo))Bis-

Trade Name Mixture(s):

Actiphyte of Avocado BG50(2) (Active Organics)

Actiphyte of Avocado GL50(3) (Active Organics)

Actiphyte of Avocado Lipo S(4) (Active Organics)

Actiphyte of Avocado PG50(5) (Active Organics)

Avocado Extract HS 2384 G(6) (Grau)

Avocado Milk(7) (CEP (Solabia))

Complex NR(8) (CEP (Solabia))

Cremogen Avocado (PN 773 521)(9) (Haarmann & Reimer)

Dry Hair Complex MU 3774(10) (Laboratoire MU)

Extrait D'Avocat MPE100(11) (Yves Rocher)

Extrapone Avocado Special 2/034599(12) (Dragoco)

Noster A(13) (Ennagram)

Noster MX(14) (Ennagram)

Phytelene of Avocado EG 460 Liquid(15) (Indena SA)

Phytogreen 55 of Avocado EXH 681 Liquid(16) (Phytochim)

Prodhy Extract Avocat(17) (Prod'Hyg)

VT-074 Extract of Avocado(18) (Vege-Tech)

International Cosmetic Ingredient Dictionary and Handbook, 8th Edition, Printed Edition Page Number: 1069

Cross References: [International Buyers' Guide] (19)[CTFA List of Japanese Cosmetic Ingredients]
These hypertext links will activate when associated electronic books are purchased.

TRITICUM VULGARE (WHEAT) GERM EXTRACT

CAS No.
84012-44-2

EINECS No.
281-689-7

Definition: Triticum Vulgare (Wheat) Germ Extract is an extract of the germ of the wheat, *Triticum vulgare*.

Regulatory and Ingredient Use Information for Botanicals(1)

Information Source(s): See note below regarding entries, and links.JCIC, JCLS

Chemical Class(es): Biological Products

Function(s): Skin Bleaching Agent; Skin-Conditioning Agent - Miscellaneous

Reported Product Categories: Body and Hand Preparations (Excluding Shaving Preparations); Skin Care Preparations, Misc.; Night Skin Care Preparations; Face and Neck Preparations (Excluding Shaving Preparations); Shampoos (Non-coloring); Tonics, Dressings, and Other Hair Grooming Aids

Technical/Other Name(s):

Extract of Triticum Vulgare Germ
Extract of Wheat Germ
Triticum Aestivum Germ Extract
Triticum Vulgare (EU)
Wheat Germ Extract

Trade Name(s):

Defensine (Silab)
Fitobroside (Pentapharm/Centerchem)
Vitaminic Mixture From Wheat (Inocosm)

Trade Name Mixture(s):

Actiphyte of Wheat Germ(2) (Active Organics)
Actiphyte of Wheat Germ BG50(3) (Active Organics)
Actiphyte of Wheat Germ GL50(4) (Active Organics)
Actiphyte of Wheat Germ Lipo S(5) (Active Organics)
Actiphyte of Wheat Germ PG50(6) (Active Organics)
Biobranil Watersoluble 2/012600(7) (Dragoco)
296 Blend for Elderly Skin HS(8) (Alban Muller)
696 Blend for Elderly Skin LS(9) (Alban Muller)
Brookosome Herbal 1(10) (Brooks)
Clariskin II(11) (Silab)
Complex GT(12) (Fabriquimica)
Corygerm(13) (Bertin)
EASHAVE(14) (Pentapharm/Centerchem)
238 Emollient HS(15) (Alban Muller)
Filagrinol-Ext(16) (Vevy)
Germamande(17) (Bertin)
Germepeautre(18) (Greentech)
Granoliquid (Wheat Germ Extract, Water Soluble)(19) (Croda GmbH)
Heliogerm(20) (Bertin)
Herbasol-Extract Nasturtium(21) (Cosmetochem)
Herbasol-Extract Wheat Germ(22) (Cosmetochem)
263 Kalokiros HS(23) (Alban Muller)
663 Kalokiros LS(24) (Alban Muller)
313 Nutriderme HS(25) (Alban Muller)
613 Nutriderme LS(26) (Alban Muller)

Plant Ceramides GfN(27) (GfN)
Pronalen Fibroactif HSC(28) (Provital/Centerchem)
330 Regederme HS(29) (Alban Muller)
630 Regederme LS(30) (Alban Muller)
269 Solarium HS(31) (Alban Muller)
669 Solarium LS(32) (Alban Muller)
T.R.D. Complex(33) (Silab)
Vitaderm(34) (Fabriquimica)
Wheat Germ Extract HS 3499 G(35) (Grau)
Wheat HS(36) (Alban Muller)
Wheat LS(37) (Alban Muller)

**International Cosmetic Ingredient Dictionary and Handbook, 8th Edition, Printed Edition Page
Number: 1535**

Cross References: [International Buyers' Guide] (38)[CTFA List of Japanese Cosmetic Ingredients]
These hypertext links will activate when associated electronic books are purchased.

EPILOBIUM ANGUSTIFOLIUM EXTRACT

Definition: Epilobium Angustifolium Extract is an extract of the aerial parts of *Epilobium angustifolium*.

Regulatory and Ingredient Use Information for Botanicals(1)

Chemical Class(es): Biological Products

Function(s): Skin-Conditioning Agent - Miscellaneous

Technical/Other Name(s):

Epilobium Angustifolium (EU)

Extract of Epilobium Angustifolium

Trade Name(s):

Canadian Willowherb Extract (5% clear) (Fytokem)

Canadian Willowherb Extract (5% in water) (Fytokem)

Trade Name Mixture(s):

Cosflor Willow Herb HGS(2) (A & E Connock)

Willowherb Extract(3) (Cosmetic Developments)

International Cosmetic Ingredient Dictionary and Handbook, 8th Edition, Printed Edition Page

Number: 511

Cross References: [International Buyers' Guide] (4) These hypertext links will activate when associated electronic books are purchased.

PHASEOLUS VULGARIS

Definition:

Regulatory and Ingredient Use Information for EU Botanical Functions(1)

Chemical Class(es): Biological Products

Technical/Other Name(s):

Phaseolus Vulgaris (Kidney Bean) Seed Extract (U.S.)

International Cosmetic Ingredient Dictionary and Handbook, 8th Edition, Printed Edition Page Number: 1073

Cross References: [International Buyers' Guide] (2) These hypertext links will activate when associated electronic books are purchased.

PHASEOLUS VULGARIS (KIDNEY BEAN) SEED EXTRACT

CAS No.

85085-22-9

EINECS No.

285-354-6

Definition: Phaseolus Vulgaris (Kidney Bean) Seed Extract is an extract of the seeds of the kidney bean, *Phaseolus vulgaris*.

Regulatory and Ingredient Use Information for Botanicals(3)

Chemical Class(es): Biological Products

Function(s): Skin-Conditioning Agent - Miscellaneous

Technical/Other Name(s):

Extract of Kidney Beans

Extract of Phaseolus Vulgaris

Kidney Bean Extract

Kidney Bean Seed Extract

Phaseolus Vulgaris (EU)

Phaseolus Vulgaris Extract

Trade Name Mixture(s):

Bean Extract(4) (Basic American Foods)

287 Demaquillant HS(5) (Alban Muller)

238 Emollient HS(6) (Alban Muller)

International Cosmetic Ingredient Dictionary and Handbook, 8th Edition, Printed Edition Page Number: 1073

Cross References: [International Buyers' Guide] (7) These hypertext links will activate when associated electronic books are purchased.